1 2 3 4 5 6	Mark Holscher (S.B.N. 139582) R. Alexander Pilmer (S.B.N. 166196) Mark T. Cramer (S.B.N. 198952) KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 777 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 680-8400 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500 E-mail: mholscher@kirkland.com apilmer@kirkland.com mcramer@kirkland.com			
7	Attorneys for Defendant California Institute of Technology			· .
9	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COUR	Γ	•
10	CENTRAL DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORN	IA	
11				
12	Robert M. Nelson, William Bruce	CASE NO. CV-0	7-05669 OD	W (VBKX)
13	Banerdt, Julia Bell, Josette Bellan, Dennis V. Byrnes, George Carlisle, Kent Robert Crossin, Larry R. D'Addario,	The Hon. Otis D.	Wright II	
14	Riley M. Duren, Peter R. Eisenhardt, Susan D.J. Foster, Matthew P.	CALIFORNIA I TECHNOLOGY	''S OPPOSI	TION TO
	Golombek, Varoujan Gorjian, Zareh	PLAINTIFFS' M)R
15	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck,	PRELIMINARY	INJUNCT	
15 16	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date:	October 1,	ION
16 17	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M.)	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:		ION
16 17 18	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION
16 17 18 19	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M.) Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder Hale, William John Walker and Paul R.	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION
16 17 18 19 20	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M.) Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder Hale, William John Walker and Paul R. Weissman,	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION
16 17 18 19 20 21	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M.) Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder Hale, William John Walker and Paul R. Weissman, Plaintiffs, vs. National Aeronautics and Space	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION
16 17 18 19 20	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M. Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder Hale, William John Walker and Paul R. Weissman, Plaintiffs, vs. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, an Agency of the United States; Michael Griffin, Director of	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M.) Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder Hale, William John Walker and Paul R. Weissman, Plaintiffs, vs. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, an Agency of the United States; Michael Griffin, Director of NASA, in his official capacity only; Department of Commerce; Carlos M.	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M. Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder Hale, William John Walker and Paul R. Weissman, Plaintiffs, vs. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, an Agency of the United States; Michael Griffin, Director of NASA, in his official capacity only;	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck, Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A. Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M. Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder Hale, William John Walker and Paul R. Weissman, Plaintiffs, vs. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, an Agency of the United States; Michael Griffin, Director of NASA, in his official capacity only; Department of Commerce; Carlos M. Gutierrez, Secretary of Commerce, in his official capacity only; California Institute	PRELIMINARY Hearing Date: Time:	October 1, 4:00 pm	ION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2		Page(s)			
3	INTRODUCTION	1			
4	FACTUAL BACKGROUND				
5	ARGUMENT				
6	I. Plaintiffs Are Not Likely To Succeed On Any Of Their Claims Against Caltech.				
7 8	A. Neither the Privacy Act nor the Administrative Procedures Act Applies to Caltech Because Caltech is a Private Entity				
9	B. Caltech Is A Private Entity and Is Not Engaging In Any Alleged "Government" Conduct That Violates the Constitution	10			
10 11	C. Plaintiffs Lack Standing Because There is No Article III Case or Controversy Here				
12	D. Even If Caltech Were Subject to US Constitutional Limitations, Which It Is Not, Plaintiffs' Constitutional Claims Lack Merit	16			
13 14	(i) Plaintiffs' 14th Amendment Claim Lacks Merit Because That Amendment Only Applies to States				
15	(ii) Plaintiffs' Fourth Amendment Claim Lacks Merit Because There Has Been Neither A Search Nor A Seizure				
16 17	(iii) Plaintiffs' Asserted Privacy Right Has Not Been Recognized In This Context	i			
18	(iv) The Background Check Program is Minimal and Reasonable	21			
19 20	II. Plaintiffs Suffer No Irreparable Harm Because They Have Adequate Remedies At Law	25			
21	III. There is No Threatened Irreparable Harm to the Public	27			
22	CONCLUSION	28			
23					
24					
25					
26					
.0 27					
8					

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

2	Page(s)
3	CASES
4	Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees, AFL-CIO v. Dept. of Housing & Urban Dev. 118 F.3d 786 (D.C. Cir. 1997)
5	
6	Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees, Local 1857 v. Wilson No. 89-1274, 1990 WL 208749 (E.D. Cal. July 9, 1990)26
7	Anderson v. U.S. 612 F.2d 1112 (9th Cir. 1979)
8	Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics,
9	403 U.S. 388 (1971)
10	Bluestein v. Skinner 908 F.2d 451 (9th Cir. 1990)
11	Bolling v. Sharpe
12	347 U.S. 497 (1954)
13	California v. FCC
14	Casey v. Lewis
15	4 F.3d 1516 (9th Cir.1993)
16	Coral Const. Co. v. King County, 941 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1991)
17	Croddy v. FBI
18	No. 00-651, 2006 WL 2844261 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 2006)
19	Dept. of the Navy v. Egan 484 U.S. 518 (1988)25
20	Doe v. Attorney General
21	941 F.2d 780 (9th Cir. 1991)
22	Dong v. Smithsonian Inst., 125 F.3d. 877 (D.C. Cir. 1997)
23	
24	Farris v. Rice 453 F. Supp. 2d 76 (D.D.C. 2006)
25	Flagg Bros., v. Brooks 436 U.S. 149 (1978)
26	Gonzalez v. Metro. Transp. Auth.
27	73 Fed. Appx. 986 (9th Cir. 2003)
28	

1	GoTo.com, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co. 202 F.3d 1199 (9th Cir. 2000)
2	Harmon v. Thornburgh 878 F. 2d 484 (D.C. Cir. 1989)
4	In re Crawford 194 F.3d 954 (9th Cir. 1999)
5	Int'l Bhd. of Elec. Workers v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n 966 F.2d 521 (9th Cir. 1992)
. 7	Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co. 457 U.S. 922 (1982)
8	Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife 504 U.S. 555 (1992)
10	Minn. Ass'n of Nurse Anesthetists v. Unity Hosp. 59 F.3d 80 (8 th Cir.1995)26
11	Nat'l Fed'n of Fed. Employees v. Greenberg
12	983 F.2d 286 (D.C. Cir. 1993)
13	Nat'l Treasury Employees Union v. Von Raab 489 U.S. 656 (1989)17
14 15	National Treasury Employees Union v. U.S. Dept. of Treasury 25 F.3d 237 (5th Cir. 1994)
16 17	National Treasury Employees Union v. U.S. Dept. of Treasury 838 F. Supp. 631 (D.D.C. 1993)
18	O'Connor v. Ortega 480 U.S. 709 (1987)24
19	Planned Parenthood of Southern Arizona v. Lawall 307 F.3d 783 (9th Cir. 1999)
20 21	Rendell-Baker v. Kohn 457 U.S. 830 (1982)
22	C.N. ex rel. J.N. v. Ridgewood Bd. of Ed. 319 F. Supp. 2d 483 (D.N.J. 2004)
23	Skinner v. Ry. Labor Executive Ass'n 489 U.S. 602 (1989)
24 25	Chimney D. Labor Fracutives, Ass're
26	489 U.S. 602 (1989)
27	Stanley v. University of Southern California 13 F.3d 1313 (9th Cir. 1994)
28	

1	Sutton v. Providence St. Joseph Med. Ctr. 192 F.3d 826 (9th Cir. 1999)
2	Thomas v. Anchorage Equal Rights Comm'n
3	220 F.3d 1134 (9th Cir. 2000)
4	Thorne v. City of El Segundo 726 F.2d 459 (9th Cir. 1983)
5	Thorne v. City of El Segundo
6	802 F.2d 1131 (9th Cir. 1986)
7	Tucson Woman's Clinic v. Eden 379 F.3d 531 (9th Cir. 2004)
8	U.S. ex rel. Giles v. Sardie 191 F. Supp. 2d 1117 (C.D. Cal. 2000)
10	U.S. v. Coronado
11	461 F. Supp. 2d 1209 (S.D. Cal. 2006)
12	U.S. v. Nerber 222 F.3d 597 (9th Cir. 2000)
13	U.S. v. Romm 455 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2006)
14	United States v. Salerno
15	481 U.S. 739 (1987)
16	Unt v. Aerospace Corp. 765 F.2d 1440 (9th Cir. 1985)9
17 18	Western State Univ. of S. Cal. v. Am. Bar Ass'n 301 F. Supp. 2d 1129 (C.D. Cal. 2004)
19	Whalen v. Roe 429 U.S. 589 (1977)
20	
21	Willner v. Thornburgh 928 F.2d 1185 (D.C. 1991)
22	STATUTES
23	5 U.S.C. § 552a
24	5 U.S.C. §§ 701(b)(1), 7029
25	U.S.C. § 552(f)
26	OTHER
27	45 CFR § 164.508
28	Law of Computer Technology § 16:56 (2007)

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs are indeed well-respected and valued government contractors who support very important public projects involving the United States' missions to outerspace, while working on the federal government's property located at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory ("JPL"). Caltech respects and values the contributions its employees have made to the United States while working at JPL. Caltech hopes that after Plaintiffs have dispassionately reviewed the specifics of the proposed background checks as detailed in Caltech's brief and NASA's brief, Plaintiffs will file for the federal identification badge necessary to have unescorted access to a federally-owned property.

Given the nature of the work carried out for the government at JPL, however, it is not unreasonable for the government to require some degree of assurance that individuals with uncontrolled access to its facility are not a threat. In this case, the federal government is asking Plaintiffs to provide their employment and educational history, to disclose whether they have used illegal drugs in the last year, and to self-select three references to attest to the fact that they are not a threat to others at JPL or to the United States. Contrary to Plaintiffs' hypothetical concerns, the references are not asked to disclose sensitive personal information.

Moreover, Plaintiffs have already voluntarily disclosed much of the information requested by the government when they first applied for a job at JPL. Seven of the plaintiffs also voluntarily disclosed much more detailed, potentially sensitive information to the federal government when they sought heightened security clearances in order to work on secret projects. And three other Plaintiffs have completed SF 85, the very form at issue here.

Plaintiffs ask this Court to invalidate the federal government's background check—a result which would have far-reaching implications—on the grounds that it violates their constitutional right to privacy. But a number of cases not cited by Plaintiffs have scrutinized the use of background checks and have found them to be

constitutional. Plaintiffs rely on several inapplicable cases involving forced drug testing, but there is no forced search or seizure of any of the Plaintiffs here.

Plaintiffs' request for preliminary injunctive relief against Caltech fails for several reasons:

First, Plaintiffs cannot demonstrate a likelihood of success against Caltech on their Privacy Act claim. The Privacy Act only applies to federal government agencies, and Caltech is not a federal government agency.

Second, Caltech is a private entity, and thus cannot be liable for any constitutional violation alleged by Plaintiffs here, even assuming the government actually violated some constitutional right. Caltech did not create the badge-issuance process at issue here, Caltech does not conduct any background checks on any individuals, and Caltech does not determine who receives a badge allowing access to JPL.

Third, there is no constitutional case or controversy because Plaintiffs' claimed injuries are hypothetical or conjectural. No one has asked Plaintiffs to provide their most sensitive, private information relating to parenting decisions or sensitive medical conditions, and no such information has been disclosed publicly.

Fourth, Plaintiffs cannot prevail on their 14th Amendment claim. This amendment applies only to the states, and neither NASA nor Caltech is a state. Similarly, Plaintiffs' 4th Amendment claim fails because the 4th Amendment restricts searches and seizures by the federal government and the background check here is neither a search nor a seizure.

Fifth, Plaintiffs attempt to assert an "informational" right of privacy that the courts have narrowly recognized, primarily in cases involving forced disclosure of highly personal medical information, or personal decisions regarding abortions or birth control. Courts are skeptical about expanding that right beyond those narrow circumstances, and no circuit court has done so in any case involving a background check.

. .

Sixth, preliminary injunctive relief is inappropriate because, as a matter of law, the potential loss of employment is compensable in money damages and therefore, does not constitute irreparable harm.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

JPL is a federally funded research and development center managed by Caltech pursuant to a contract with NASA. See Proia Decl. ¶ 3. JPL is an integral part of the nation's space program. See Aden Decl. ¶ 4. JPL is involved in a wide variety of complex missions, including high profile and widely publicized projects like the Mars Explorer Rovers Mission; the Cassini Mission to Saturn; and the Voyager Mission to Jupiter, Saturn and beyond. Id. The command center for the rovers operating on Mars, the Space Flight Operations Center for JPL missions, and JPL's Space Craft Assembly building are located on the JPL campus. Id. In addition, JPL manages from its campus the Deep Space Network, which is responsible for monitoring and communicating with numerous satellites and other space missions. Id. JPL is also involved in other highly confidential projects that require security clearances. Id.

JPL's facilities where this sensitive work is conducted are located on about 175 acres of federally-owned land in Pasadena and La Cañada Flintridge, California. *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 7; *id.*, Ex. 1 (aerial photograph of JPL's facilities); *id.*, Ex. 2 (map depicting the layout of JPL).

There are more than 7,500 individuals who may require access to JPL. *See*Aden Decl. ¶ 5. Many of those personnel require (and have) security clearances. *Id.*¶ 4. Given the nature of JPL's activities, the types of projects it handles, and the close proximity of its sensitive and non-sensitive facilities, anyone with unescorted access privileges has the ability to get very close to facilities where sensitive work is conducted, whether or not they have security clearances. *Id.* ¶ 8. While JPL has great faith and confidence in its employees, the potential nonetheless exists for someone with unescorted access to JPL to cause serious damage to the publicly-funded

missions JPL handles. *Id.* It is therefore important for NASA to investigate the background of those with unescorted privileges, even if those people will not have access inside the sensitive facilities themselves.

Heightened Security Requirements For Federally-Owned Facilities

On August 27, 2004, the President of the United States issued Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 ("HSPD 12"). *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 9. Thereafter, the Department of Commerce published Federal Information Processing Standards Publication No. 201-1 ("FIPS 201-1"), which set forth a standard for personal identity verification of federal employees and contractors. *Id.* To ensure compliance with HSPD 12 and FIPS 201-1, NASA issued Procurement Information Circular 06-01, which set forth requirements for contractor personnel working at JPL and other NASA-related facilities to apply for and obtain uniform security access badges. *Id.*

The Badge Issuance Process

Under its contract with NASA, Caltech is required to comply with certain government policies, including executive orders of the President. *See* Proia Decl. ¶ 5. The contract also allows NASA to unilaterally modify the contract when exigent circumstances exist. *Id.* With respect to the new badge issuance procedures, NASA invoked the "exigent circumstances" provision of the contract and mandated JPL to "immediately comply" with the new procedures set forth in PIC 06-01. *See* Proia Decl. ¶¶ 6-10.

NASA created the processes required to obtain an access badge to NASA facilities, but the bulk of the process is completed by the federal government's Office of Personnel Management or "OPM." JPL has no control over: (1) the background investigation required to obtain a badge, or (2) whether an individual will be approved to receive a badge. *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 10.

Although the badge-issuance process is not JPL's, JPL has regularly communicated with its personnel regarding the steps they were required to take to obtain a badge. On February 22, 2007, JPL advised all personnel that they would

have to obtain a new identification badge, which would "require [] significant changes in the issuance of badges." *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 12, Ex.3 thereto. On March 28, 2007, JPL sent an e-mail to all personnel advising them of the requirements for obtaining a new badge, including the need to complete a background investigation. *Id.*, Ex. 4. JPL also posted on its internal website a chart which provided an overview of the process. *Id.*, Ex. 5.

Before any applicant could apply for a badge, JPL had to make an initial determination about the "risk classification" appropriate for any particular job. See Aden Decl. ¶ 13. As requested by the government, JPL applied the criteria developed by the federal government to determine which jobs should be classified as having low, moderate, or high risk. See Hart Decl. ¶ 6. A very high percentage of those needing badges in order to access JPL's facilities have a "low" risk classification, which results in the least intrusive background check available. Id. ¶ 8. Each of the Plaintiffs in this case was classified as "low" risk.

Applicants for badges begin the application process on the federal government Office of Personnel Management's secure online system called "e-QIP," which is located at http://www.opm.gov/e-qip/. See Aden Decl. ¶ 15. Applicants cannot preapply for clearance and can only access the e-QIP website to start the application process when they are "invited to do so by an appropriate official at their sponsoring agency." See http://www.opm.gov/e-qip/. Even though JPL is not a federal agency, NASA has delegated to JPL the ministerial task of serving as the "sponsoring agency" because JPL was the only entity with knowledge of the identity of the employees who needed access to the facility. See Aden Decl. ¶ 14. JPL's Office of Protective Services, therefore, sent out e-mail notices to various personnel on a rolling basis notifying them when they could begin the application process on e-QIP. Id.

When applicants log on to the e-QIP system, they provide the requested information directly to the federal government—not to JPL. *Id.* ¶ 16. Applicants have 10 days from the receipt of the initiation e-mail to complete the form.

The primary form that applicants are required to complete is Standard Form 85 (or "SF 85"), which is a standard form the federal government requires for those seeking employment in low-risk positions with the government. *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 16. JPL did not create SF 85, nor did JPL select SF 85 as the form to use for these purposes. The applicants complete SF 85 on the secure e-QIP website. *Id.*¹

SF 85 contains a five-page questionnaire, which asks 14 different questions. See Compl., Ex. 1; Aden Decl. ¶ 17. SF 85 also includes an Authorization for Release of Information ("Authorization"). The Authorization states that any information disclosed in response to the Authorization "is for official use by the Federal Government only for the purposes provided in this Standard Form 85, and may be redisclosed by the Government only as authorized by law." See Compl., Ex.1. JPL has specifically advised its personnel that the Authorization does not allow the government to access medical or private financial records. See Aden Decl. ¶ 21.

After the applicant completes SF 85 in the e-QIP system, an authorized individual in JPL's OPS department is given access to the form to "approve" it. See Aden Decl. ¶ 23. In this context, to "approve" the form simply means that someone has reviewed the form for completeness, i.e. someone has confirmed that the applicant provided all of the information requested in the form. Id. The approvers do not disclose any information contained on the form to anyone else and no one at JPL takes any steps to investigate or confirm the accuracy of any of the information provided on SF 85. JPL has hired 22 contractors—who have at least secret clearances and are approved by OPM—to fulfill this "approver" function. Id.

Once the approver confirms that an applicant's SF 85 is complete, the completed form is sent to the government's OPM for further processing. *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 23. Because all of the data is entered electronically by the applicants, it is

Plaintiffs' assertion that Caltech faculty are not required to obtain a badge is false. Caltech faculty must go through the same process as Plaintiffs. See Aden Decl. ¶ 30.

1 2 3

5.

.22

maintained in OPM's e-QIP system. *Id.* ¶ 24. Although some of the approvers may print the forms as part of their review process, once the forms have been approved, all hard copies of the completed SF 85 are shredded. JPL maintains no record of the data contained within SF 85. *Id.*

Once the completed SF 85s have been submitted and approved, OPM and NASA "adjudicate" the application. JPL plays no role and has no say in the adjudication process. *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 25. After OPM and NASA adjudicate an application, the individuals are notified by NASA if they did not pass. Those who do not pass can appeal the decision with NASA; JPL plays no role and has no say in the appeal process. In fact, JPL is not even advised of the reasons why any applicant is denied a badge, and JPL cannot participate in the decision-making process or appeal. *Id.* ¶¶ 25-27.

Status of the Badge Issuance Process at JPL

Since April 2007, more than 4,100 individuals at JPL have submitted their SF 85s to the government. See Aden Decl. ¶ 28. Over 57,000 individuals are subject to the new badge-issuance requirements at all NASA facilities. As of August 31, 2007, over 46,000 of those individuals have applied for their badges. *Id*.

Of the named Plaintiffs in this case, three (Julia Bell, Amy Hale, and Peter Shames) have already provided the information requested in SF 85 to the government. *Id.* ¶ 29. Moreover, a number of the named Plaintiffs in this case have held security clearances in the past, which means that these individuals underwent a far more extensive background check than what is being asked of them here. *Id.* ¶ 31. To receive a security clearance today, an applicant would complete, at a minimum, Standard Form 85P, or Standard Form 86, both of which require more information spanning more time than that required on SF 85. *Id.* ¶ 31; *id.* Ex. 6 (chart summarizing differences between SF 85, SF 85P, and SF 86).

Turnover of Personnel at JPL

Like any large organization, JPL experiences turnover for a variety of reasons and is accustomed to replacing various employees who change positions or leave. For example, in 2006, approximately 178 employees were laid off, 61 retired, 155 left voluntarily, and 15 left JPL for other reasons. *See* Hart Decl. ¶ 9. In total, more than 400 employees left JPL just last year. In addition, JPL received more than 5,300 inquiries for approximately 600 job openings last year; in other words, almost 10 qualified applications for every job. *Id.* While Caltech values its talented and exceptional employees and works hard to retain them, Caltech has always been able to find qualified individuals to take their place with minimal disruption to the important projects that JPL handles. *Id.* JPL employees who choose not to apply for the federally-required access badge will be considered to have a voluntarily resigned from their employment. *Id.*

ARGUMENT

To obtain preliminary injunctive relief, a plaintiff must demonstrate: (1) a combination of probable success on the merits and the possibility of irreparable injury; or (2) the existence of serious questions going to the merits and a balance of hardships tipping sharply in the moving party's favor. *See GoTo.com, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.*, 202 F.3d 1199, 1204-05 (9th Cir. 2000). As detailed below, Plaintiffs have not demonstrated likelihood of success or even a serious question on the merits or irreparable harm.

I. PLAINTIFFS ARE NOT LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON ANY OF THEIR CLAIMS AGAINST CALTECH.

In their moving papers, Plaintiffs claim Caltech violated the Privacy Act, the Administrative Procedures Act, the 14th Amendment and the 4th Amendment. They are not likely to succeed on any of these claims.²

While Plaintiffs plead a cause of action under the California Constitution in their (Continued...)

A. Neither the Privacy Act nor the Administrative Procedures Act Applies to Caltech Because Caltech is a Private Entity.

Plaintiffs' fourth cause of action alleges that Caltech violated the Privacy Act. See Compl. 21. But the Privacy Act, which is codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a, applies only to an "agency." See 5 U.S.C. § 552(f) ("agency" is defined as executive departments of the federal government). Courts have refused to expand the Privacy Act to apply to private entities like Caltech. See Unt v. Aerospace Corp., 765 F.2d 1440, 1447 (9th Cir. 1985) (private not-for-profit corporation doing business with the federal government not an agency subject to suit under the Privacy Act); Dong v. Smithsonian Inst., 125 F.3d. 877, 879 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (Smithsonian not an agency under the Privacy Act). Plaintiffs present no argument that the Privacy Act should apply to Caltech. Accordingly, this claim cannot serve as the basis for issuing a preliminary injunction here.

Plaintiffs did not plead an Administrative Procedures Act claim against Caltech. See Compl. 5. They do, however, group all "defendants" together in their brief, suggesting they may intend to bring this claim against Caltech. But the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") only applies to government agencies—not private universities like Caltech. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 701(b)(1), 702 (the APA defines "agency" as "each authority of the Government of the United States. . . ." and the Act only allows judicial review for persons "suffering legal wrong because of agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action. . ."); 3 see also Western

complaint, they do not rely on or even mention it in their motion for a preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs cannot raise arguments for the first time in their reply that were not include in their opening brief. See U.S. v. Romm, 455 F.3d 990, 997 (9th Cir. 2006) ("arguments not raised by a party in its opening brief are deemed waived."); see also U.S. ex rel. Giles v. Sardie, 191 F. Supp. 2d 1117, 1127 (C.D. Cal. 2000) ("It is improper for a moving party to introduce new facts or different legal arguments in the reply brief than those presented in the moving papers.").

All internal citations and quotations are omitted in all citations throughout this brief unless otherwise noted.

State Univ. v. Am. Bar Ass'n, 301 F. Supp. 2d 1129, 1133 (C.D. Cal. 2004) ("By its own language, the APA does not extend to an entity that is not a federal agency. . . .").

Thus, two of Plaintiffs' four causes of action against Caltech fail as a matter of law because the statutes they are based on do not apply to private entities like Caltech. Accordingly, those claims cannot support the preliminary injunction Plaintiffs seek.

B. Caltech Is A Private Entity and Is Not Engaging In Any Alleged "Government" Conduct That Violates the Constitution.

Neither the 4th Amendment nor the 14th Amendment applies to private entities. See, e.g., Flagg Bros., v. Brooks, 436 U.S. 149, 156 (1978) (constitutional rights can only be infringed by governments or those acting under the color of law).⁴ Plaintiffs do not even attempt to explain how these constitutional provisions apply to a private entity like Caltech. See Compl. ¶ 33 ("[Caltech] is a non-profit educational institution.").

The only exception to this bedrock principle is when a private entity is found to be a "state actor." The Supreme Court instructs that there should be "careful adherence" to the state actor requirement in order to maintain "an area of individual freedom by limiting the reach of federal law and federal judicial power." *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 936 (1982). Indeed, courts start with the "presumption that private conduct does not constitute governmental action." *Sutton v. Providence St. Joseph Med. Ctr.*, 192 F.3d 826, 835 (9th Cir. 1999). "In order for private conduct to constitute governmental action, 'something more' must be present." *Id.* (citing *Lugar*, 457 U.S. at 939).

Caltech does not fall within the exception. Caltech is a private contractor, subject to federal regulations. It engages in no conduct implicating any constitutional

See also discussion at sections I. D.(i) and I. D.(ii) explaining that the Fourteenth Amendment only applies to the states, and that the Fourth Amendment restricts searches and seizures by the federal government.

27.

inquiry, and Plaintiffs point to none. Rather, Plaintiffs provide specific allegations relating to their constitutional claims only with respect to *government* entities:

- the President signed the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (HSPD-12) applicable to all Executive Branch departments and agencies;
- the US Department of Commerce promulgated the "Personal Identity Verification" ("PIV") standard, specifying the background investigation will be a "National Agency Check with Inquiries" which requires completion of SF 85;
- NASA issued Procurement Information Circular 06-01establishing the new policy for creation and issuance of federal credentials at NASA and instituted a new identification badge known as the PIV or PIV II;
- A federal employee will perform an adjudication of employees' suitability if the badge issuance process yields unfavorable information; and
- NASA requires the implementation of a background investigation and release of information.

There is not a sufficient nexus between Caltech and the federal government's actions with respect to HSPD-12 to find Caltech to be a state actor here. Caltech's only connection is that it operates JPL pursuant to a contract with NASA and, by law and by contract, must abide by NASA's required security measures for entering the NASA facility. All of the alleged unconstitutional conduct—namely the creation, implementation, and enforcement of the background check and records release—is government conduct.

In *Sutton*, the Ninth Circuit held that a hospital's decision not to hire the plaintiff when he refused to provide his social security number, as required by federal law, did not make the hospital a state actor. *See Sutton*, 192 F.3d at 843. Governmental compulsion in the form of a generally applicable law, without more, does not make a private entity a governmental actor. *Id.* at 841. Rather, a plaintiff must show "some other nexus . . . [t]ypically . . . participation by the state in an action ostensibly taken by the private entity, through conspiratorial agreement, official cooperation with the private entity to achieve the private entity's goal, or enforcement and ratification of the private entity's chosen action." *Id.*

Caltech's ministerial conduct relating to the implementation of the badge issuance process is like the hospital's conduct in *Sutton*. For instance, Caltech contractors verify that the SF 85s are completed, but they do not conduct any substantive review of the information in those forms. *See* Aden Decl. ¶ 23. This type of passive participation does not turn Caltech into a state actor. Nor is Caltech a state actor simply because it operates JPL pursuant to federal regulations or because it receives federal funding. "Acts of such private contractors do not become acts of the government by reason of their significant or even total engagement in performing public contracts." *See Rendell-Baker v. Kohn*, 457 U.S. 830, 841 (1982). Indeed, Caltech's contract with NASA explicitly states that "[n]otwithstanding the special relationship created by this sponsoring agreement, the California Institute of Technology is acting as a contractor and not as an agent of the Government." *See* Proia Decl. ¶ 3.

There are also potentially serious repercussions if this Court were to require a private entity like Caltech to defend the constitutionality of a government-ordered program. To do so would be to "convert every employer...into a governmental actor every time it complies with a presumptively valid, generally applicable law." *Sutton*, 192 F.3d at 838. If that were the law, Caltech would be forced to "defend those laws and pay any consequent damages, even though [it] bear[s] no real responsibility for the violation of rights arising from the enactment of the laws." *Id.* at 838-39; *see also Lugar*, 457 U.S. at 937 (cautioning that if courts do not enforce the state actor nexus "private parties could face constitutional litigation whenever they seek to rely on some state rule governing their interactions with the community surrounding them."). Private actors are entitled to rely on the presumptive validity of laws and regulations. To hold a private party responsible for a law or regulation that it did not create broadens the Constitution far beyond its intended limit.⁵

This result also makes sense when one imagines the broad array of private (Continued...)